## REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-21 are pending in the present application and stand rejected. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Fox</u> (U.S. Patent No. 4,095,739) in view of <u>Wiedemer</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,047,928), in view of <u>Barritz</u> (EP 0 854 421 A1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants fully maintain previous arguments and submit the following.

A substantial flaw with the Examiner's arguments is that <u>Wiedemer</u> necessarily assumes an operating system *already* exists before the billing system can be used. For example, Figure 1 of <u>Wiedemer</u> shows a personal computer (10) connected to a disk drive (12). An operating system is necessary to operate the disk drive to the software to be billed and/or to load the billing software. An operating system is also necessary to access the security module (16). The Examiner has not explained how the personal computer can access the disk drive and the security module (16) without an operating system in the first place.

Therefore, the only conclusion left is that the user of <u>Wiedemer</u> already has complete and unrestricted access to the computer, which necessarily includes access the operating system. The instant claims, however, are directed to "temporary access to a commonly accessible computer." Under the Examiner's flawed interpretation of <u>Wiedemer</u>, a user would load an operating system in a completely unrestricted computer already with an operating system (e.g., a personal computer) to gain "temporary access" to the computer. Why would a user desire to gain temporary access to a computer in which he/she already has completely unrestricted access? This logic does not make sense.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox, Wiedemer and Barritz, and further in view of the Microsoft Computer Dictionary.

Dependent claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-15 and 17-21 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1, 11, and 16. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Koon Hon Wong

Reg. No. 48,459

Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 Woodbury Road

Woodbury, NY 11797

Telephone: (516) 692-8888

Facsimile: (516) 692-8889